

**LAK-VROOMAN ROAD
PID 5669
VROOMAN ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT**

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT MEETING SUMMARY
for the
JANUARY 27, 2009 PUBLIC MEETING**

A public meeting for the Vrooman Road Bridge Replacement project was held on January 27, 2009 from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Leroy Community Center, Lake County, Ohio. Representatives from the Ohio Department of Transportation, Lake County Engineer's Office, and Michael Baker Jr., Inc., as listed below, were present to discuss the project status, answer any project-specific questions, and address comments concerning the proposed Vrooman Road Bridge Replacement project. The attached meeting sign-in sheet was signed by the 102 people in attendance. Of the 102 in attendance, 66 were residents, 29 were stakeholders, 6 were from the consultant project team, and one was from the media.

Name of Representative	Association Representing
Kirk Dimmick	Lake County Engineer's Office
Alan Exley	Lake County Engineer's Office
Ted Galuschik	Lake County Engineer's Office
James Gills	Lake County Engineer's Office
Bruce Landeg	Lake County Engineer's Office
Mike Bittner	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Amilyn Cedargreen	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Larry Ciborek	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Steve Collar	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Sean Milroy	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Chris Owen	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Dale Schiavoni	Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12
Tom Sorge	Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12

Residents in the immediate project area, identified stakeholders, and the general public were notified of the public meeting via various means of communication. Residents within the project area and stakeholders received a letter (attached) notifying them of the meeting. The general public was notified using legal notices placed in local and regional newspapers, and by posters placed in public areas within and near the project site.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary

January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Public Meeting Notices

Newspapers – Notices were placed in the following newspapers:

News Herald (January 14, 18 and 25, 2009)

Lake County Gazette (January 16 and 23, 2009)

Public Areas – Public Meeting Notice Posters were placed at the following locations:

Sheetz Gas Station at SR-2 and Lane Road – 2 Posters

IGA Grocery Store at SR-2 and Lane Road – 2 Posters

Perry Township Hall – 2 Posters

Leroy Township Hall and Maintenance Building – 2 Posters

Leroy Township Fire Station and Community Center – 2 Posters

5 Point Convenient Mart at Vrooman Road, SR-86 and Leroy Center Road – 1 Poster

Capps Pizza at Vrooman Road, SR-86 and Leroy Center Road – 1 Poster

BP Gas Station at Vrooman Road and I-90 Road – 1 Poster

Convenience Food Mart at Madison Avenue and Park Road Ext. Road – 1 Poster

Mason's Landing Park at Vrooman Road and Grand River – 1 Poster

Lake Metroparks' Sites - Additional posters were placed by the Lake Metroparks at their offices and at various parks and facilities.

Other - An additional notification for the meeting was posted on the ODOT maintenance garage signboard on Vrooman Road south of Interstate 90.

Public Comments

A questionnaire / comment form was distributed to all attendees of the January 27, 2009 Public Meeting. This form provided the public the opportunity to respond to specific project related questions; to make additional comments on the project; and to express personal opinion. The public was asked: how often they use the existing Vrooman Road Bridge; how they are affected when the bridge is closed; what alternative route they use when the bridge is closed and to provide details of involvement with any accidents on Vrooman Road. Completed comment forms were collected at the meeting and for a public comment period which ending on February 27, 2009. Additional comment forms were distributed in response to later requests from other members of the general public after the meeting. Respondents were given the option of turning in the form at the meeting, mailing the form to the project team or emailing an electronic version of the form. The questionnaire / comment form is presently posted on the Lake County Engineer's project web site.

A total of 46 completed comment forms (including 2 "anonymous" responses) have been received to date. 32 of the 46 responses indicated an opinion with regards to the project. Of the 32 responses with an opinion, 23 respondents were for the project and 9 respondents were against the project. Of the 9 respondents against the project, 3 respondents indicated that while they were against the project, they did show support for an alternative: 1 respondent indicated that if they had to pick from either

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Alternative A or B, they would support Alternative A; 1 respondent would be in favor for a high-level bridge if Vrooman Road were located along the CEI easement; and 1 respondent was in favor of a new interchange alternative. The remaining 14 responses were either requests for information or expressed no comment.

Support of the remaining feasible alternatives, as presented at the January 27, 2009 Public Meeting, are summarized as follows:

- 4 responses were in favor of Alternative A: High-Level crossing to Madison Avenue
- 4 responses were in favor of Alternative B: High-Level crossing to Lane Road
- 11 responses expressed no preference for a favored alternative
- 0 responses were in favor of Alternative E: No-Build
- 1 response favored a CEI Alignment for Vrooman Road
- 1 response did not want existing Vrooman Road used

Two responses indicated a preference for Alternative C: Low-Level crossing to Madison Avenue, however; this alternative does not satisfy Project Purpose and Need, and had previously been eliminated from further consideration.

The following table is a summary of project support received via the comment form, e-mail, letters, fax.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Project Support January 27, 2009 Public Meeting			
Vrooman Road Bridge Project		Favored Alternative	
For	23	Alt. A - Madison	4
		Alt. B - Lane	4
		No Preference for A/B	11
		Alt. C - Low Level	2
		Alt. D - Replace Existing	
		Alt. E - No Build	
		CEI Alignment for Vrooman Road	1
		Don't Use Existing Vrooman Road	1
Against	9* **	Alt. A - Madison	1 *
		Alt. B - Lane	
		No Preference	4
		Alt. C - Low Level	1
		Alt. D - Replace Existing	
		Alt. E - No Build	1
		CEI Alignment for Vrooman Road	1 **
		New Interchange	1
No Comment/ Expressed No Preference For or Against Project/ Other	14	No Comment	11
		Request for Information	1
		Request to Continue to be a Stakeholder	1
		Questioned Validity of and Requested Copies of Env. and Eng. Reports	1

* Against project, but if had to pick, would prefer Alternative A - Madison Ave.

** Against, but would be for the project if used CEI easement for Vrooman Road.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

The following table is a summary of public comments received via the comment form, e-mail, letters, fax. The Project Team's response follows. The original comment forms contain personal contact information and will not be released to the general public. As required, the original comment forms are in the project files.

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
The new bridge project needs to go through for personal safety, time, and expense. The current bridge is closed too often and dangerous to pass.	2	Comment noted.
In favor of Alternative A or Alternative B, no preference between the two.	2	Comment noted.
In favor of Alternative B for business and commuting purposes.	1	Comment noted.
In favor of Alternative C. I am against a high-level bridge, but if I had to choose, I would prefer Alternative A.	1	Comment noted.
If bridge were closed, I would be happy. No additional comments.	2	Comment noted.
If bridge were closed, it would be an inconvenience. No additional comments.	3	Comment noted.
While the DRAFT Vrooman Road Planning Study misidentified Vrooman Road as a nominated evacuation route by DHS, the 2009 Purpose and Need Statement does not identify Homeland Security as a primary or secondary purpose goal of this project.	1	<p>Copies of the environmental studies approved to date have been posted on the Lake County Engineer's website (http://www.lakecountyohio.org/engineer/index.html) under the Vrooman Road Bridge Project Information link (http://www.lakecountyohio.gov/vroomanroad/).</p> <p>These studies include: Updated Planning Study (Revised January, 2007 and May, 2008) with ODOT acceptance email of 06-30-08</p> <p>Approved Phase I History / Architecture Report dated July, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 09-25-08</p> <p>Approved Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
		<p>dated July 22, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 08-15-08</p> <p>Approved Noise Technical Report dated December, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 01-21-09</p> <p>Public access to the Phase I Archaeological Survey Report (2009) is restricted and was not made available on the website, in accordance with federal regulations that restrict access to archaeological site information.</p>
<p>Request for a copy of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Purpose and Need, Jan. 2009 • Stakeholder Coordination Documentation • Phase I History Architecture • Phase I Environmental Site Access • Phase I Archaeological Survey • Noise Technical Report • Level I Ecological Survey • Updated Planning Study 	1	<p>Copies of the approved environmental studies have been posted to the Lake County Engineer's website (http://www.lakecountyohio.org/engineer/index.html) under the Vrooman Road Bridge Project Information link (http://www.lakecountyohio.gov/vroomanroad/).</p> <p>These studies include: Updated Planning Study (Revised January, 2007 and May, 2008) with ODOT acceptance email of 06-30-08</p> <p>Approved Phase I History / Architecture Report dated July, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 09-25-08</p> <p>Approved Phase I Environmental Site Assessment dated July 22, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 08-15-08</p> <p>Approved Noise Technical Report dated December, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 01-21-09</p> <p>Public access to the Phase I Archaeological Survey Report (2009) is restricted and was not made available on the website, in accordance with federal regulations that restrict access to archaeological site information.</p>
We need a new bridge across the valley.	1	Comment noted.
Access to Route 90 during emergency	1	The Lake County Engineer and the Vrooman Road

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
<p>situation is imperative. It has been 24 years since the project has been in limbo, affecting property values and the ability to sell real estate. It is a public duty to make a final decision now: either construct the new bridge or come to terms and make do with what we are presently living with.</p>		<p>Bridge Replacement Project are following ODOT's Minor Project Development Process (PDP). The PDP has been established in accordance with the appropriate federal laws and FHWA guidelines. The PDP is a project management and decision-making process for transportation projects that facilitates the appropriate level of planning, environmental investigations, engineering, and public involvement and communication at each step of the process.</p> <p>The project is currently in Step 3 of the Minor PDP. Step 3 will include further environmental investigations and agency coordination; selection of a Preferred Alternative; submission of the Preliminary Engineering Study; and further public involvement activities of a Stakeholders Meeting and Public Meeting.</p>
<p>Vrooman Road Project needs to be ended because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Homeland Security never nominated Vrooman Road as the preferred evacuation route for Perry Nuclear Power Plant • Native American burial grounds near the anchor of the proposed bridge cannot be disturbed without proper sign-off from all 27 tribes or covered with concrete • Public is in support of a low-level bridge design 	1	<p>While the DRAFT Vrooman Road Planning Study misidentified Vrooman Road as a nominated evacuation route by DHS, the 2009 Purpose and Need Statement does not identify Homeland Security as a primary or secondary purpose goal of this project.</p> <p>Current engineering analysis and environmental investigation recognize that Native American burials have been identified within the project area and recommend that the proposed construction avoid the site. Once a Preferred Alternative has been selected and design plans advanced, the project's effects on the site will be determined and the appropriate coordination with between ODOT and federally recognized Native American Tribes will be undertaken as appropriate.</p> <p>The low-level alternatives for this project do not meet current project Purpose and Need and federal and state design standards, and were subsequently dismissed. A review of public comments indicates that a discrete segment of the public wants a low-level bridge crossing.</p>
<p>Vrooman Road Project needs to be ended</p>	1	<p>The project team is coordinating with the Lake</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
because the project would disrupt the beauty of the land and river. The project has been around since 1960's with no forward movement; it has been a waste of taxpayer's money. The bridge is not unsafe.		<p>Metroparks and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources – Wild and Scenic Rivers Division to minimize and mitigate impacts to the Mason's Landing Park, the Indian Point Park, and the State Wild and Scenic Grand River.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The bridge has currently posted with a 16 ton load limit. In the 2006 bridge inspection report, the Vrooman Road was rated a 3 (serious condition) on a scale from 1 (that could assume an imminent failure condition) to 9 (excellent condition).</p>
Glad to see the project is moving forward.	1	Comment noted.
<p>Rebuild Bridge to Lane according to Plan B because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan A would negatively affect my property value. • Plan B would create a direct path to Lane Ave • Plan B would be a safer and probably less expensive project • The existing bridge at Vrooman Road could be retained for foot traffic and ODNR/Metroparks use 	1	Comment noted.
In favor of Alternative E: no bridge rebuilt. If the bridge is unsafe, close it. I do not want a high-level bridge unless it could use the CEI Corridor by the high power lines.	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The CEI utility corridor is a utility easement within the Metroparks' Indian Point Park that pre-dates the park. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, does not allow a transportation project to use land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or land of an historic site if there are there are prudent and feasible alternatives to using that land. Because existing Vrooman Road can be used with all possible planning and design to meet current design standards, the new alignment would not be a prudent alternative that would minimize impacts to the park.</p>
It would seem that very little or no	1	The Vrooman Road Bridge Replacement Project is

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
<p>consideration regarding this project is being give to those who would be most affected by it. The residents of Vrooman Road. The negative effect to our property values, quality of life and destruction of our rural area, parkland, and scenic river valley does not seem important to anyone but us.</p> <p>This project is based on a continuation of lies and mistruths that stakeholders are in favor of a high level bridge, while in fact, we documented that they are in favor of a new low level bridge, above the flood plain. You state that the bridge needs to be replace because of \$70,000 in cost for maintenance, and snow and ice removal. Does this mean that the new bridge will not require maintenance or snow or ice removal? How ludicrous and ridiculous.</p> <p>And why has Townline Road never been given serious consideration? No bridge would have to built or maintained. It would not affect the river valley or Native American burial sites. There are also very few residences on Townline Road</p>		<p>utilizing ODOT's FHWA approved PDP and NEPA process, which includes the federally mandated public involvement process. This process has included public meetings, a Stakeholder Committee, and meeting with the public in 2008 during public outreach program that involved individual stakeholder groups and public officials. Input received during the public involvement process has been integrated into the design analysis, environmental investigations, and the alternatives analysis.</p> <p>While the DRAFT Vrooman Road Planning Study misidentified Vrooman Road as a nominated evacuation route by DHS, the 2009 Purpose and Need Statement does not identify Homeland Security as a primary or secondary purpose goal of this project.</p> <p>The low-level alternatives for this project do not meet current project Purpose and Need and federal and state design standards, and were subsequently dismissed.</p> <p>The replacement bridge will require annual maintenance cost, which have been incorporated into the cost benefit analysis for the project.</p> <p>The project will involve improvements to Vrooman Road, between I-90 and the new bridge, that meet current design standards, including site distances and safety standards.</p> <p>Townline Road does not address the project's Purpose and Need statement. Environmental impacts from a Townline Road connector to I-90 are not known, and may result in greater impacts to the natural and social environment.</p>
<p>There should not be a high-level bridge with access from Lane Road. Lane Road is a residential area with many homes and will disrupt the lives of the people that live there. Project coordinators should look into putting a road through an area of open</p>	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>A new interchange for I-90 on an area of open land does not meet the stated Purpose and Need for this project, and would require extensive engineering analysis and environmental investigations. A new</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
land and build a new exchange for I-90 to cut costs. I would like copies of the proposed alternatives.		<p>alignment and interchange would be a greater cost than a new bridge and improvements to existing Vrooman Road.</p> <p>Copies of the proposed alternatives can be downloaded from the project website: http://www.lakecountyohio.gov/vroomanroad/.</p>
In favor of making River Road a dead end street.	1	Comment noted.
I would like to be included as a stockholder in the future for additional input. I am a member of Leroy Township Zoning and I'm interested in Leroy and its growth.	1	Comment noted.
No high-level bridge or tractor trailer traffic. Keep Leroy local. Road is safe as is.	1	Comment noted.
<p>The project has been a disappointment since moving here over 20 years ago. I personally have seen one project attempt dumped due to the Indian bones at the top of the hill. I think the homeland security issue is nothing but a ruse to scare people into thinking only a high-level bridge is the answer. Before CEI sold the property across the street to the parks, everyone believed they would just relocate the new Vrooman over there and turn our street into an access to the parks. That land's apparently now more sacred than the Indian bones were. With the new plan, the idea that the present road can accommodate trailer trucks is not only ridiculous, it's dangerous. There is not enough room and people's homes will eventually have to be taken to straighten out the road. The government should be ashamed of how they've handled the whole thing.</p>	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>While the DRAFT Vrooman Road Planning Study misidentified Vrooman Road as a nominated evacuation route by DHS, the 2009 Purpose and Need Statement does not identify Homeland Security as a primary or secondary purpose goal of this project.</p> <p>The CEI utility corridor is a utility easement within the Metroparks' Indian Point Park that pre-dates the park. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, does not allow a transportation project to use land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or land of an historic site if there are there are prudent and feasible alternatives to using that land. Because existing Vrooman Road can be used with all possible planning and design to meet current design standards, the new alignment would not be a prudent alternative that would minimize impacts to the park.</p> <p>The project will involve improvements to Vrooman Road, between I-90 and the new bridge,</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
		that meet current design standards, including sight distances and safety standards.
There is an almost daily danger on Vrooman due to buses on curves, steep grades, flooding, snow, and the hill up to Route 84. The current road causes many problems to school schedules, often causing students to arrive very late or very early depending on the conditions.	1	Comment noted.
This project would vastly improve the safety and lives of many Leroy residents, public and visitors. Understanding that this would impact some residents, we must provide a safe road/bridge for school buses, Laketrans, and the general public.	1	Comment noted.
I am not opposed to the bridge, it is the access. Using an existing road would require a major rebuild.	1	<p>The project will involve improvements to Vrooman Road, between I-90 and the new bridge, that meet current design standards, including sight distances and safety standards.</p> <p>While using an existing road would require major construction activities, it would be less extensive than construction on a new alignment.</p>
<p>In favor of Alternative A because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intersection already exists and people are used to the traffic pattern. • Route 84 will have to be reinforced and fixed anyways there so just do the whole thing at once when placing the bridge there. • Alternative B would create more of an inconvenience because of 3 intersections in a short span, not to mention River Road's 90° turn to intersect with Route 84. • It is more practical than Alternative B. 	2	Comments noted.
I would like to see a Seeley Road relocation be a part of the negotiations with Lake Metroparks as part of	1	Seeley Road relocation is not part of this project as it is not required to construct the bridge.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
Alternative B. Additionally, has a freshwater mussel study been conducted in the section of the Grand River that will be affected by construction? Can a mussel re-location program be considered for this section of the “wild” designated section of the Grand River?		Freshwater mussel beds were not identified within project area section of the Grand River during the Level I Ecological Survey fieldwork. Because bridge piers and construction activities will not occur within the Grand River, a mussel survey and relocation is not anticipated at this time.
<p>I continue to support the low-level option (with deck slightly above the floodplain) that was in the original proposal. The low-level option would meet the requirement of replacing the existing bridge with the least disruption to the residents or park system and is also the option supported by the Metroparks, Grand River Partners and other environmental groups.</p> <p>My concerns with a high-level bridge are numerous:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high-level bridge will undoubtedly increase truck traffic and noise on Vrooman, adversely affecting park properties as well as residential property values and quality of life. • The high cost of \$25 million doesn't include improvements to the existing road and if left unchanged, the increase in truck traffic combined with curves on the road will create a very dangerous situation • The \$25 million cost will also need some funds kicked in by the county, but it's not clear where those funds will come from • The Innerbelt bridge in Cleveland should be a much higher priority for federal funding than Vrooman Road. <p>It should be further noted that after the assertion that Vrooman Road was nominated as an evacuation route by Homeland Security was proven to be untrue, the Engineer's office is now touting the number of accidents as the</p>	1	<p>The low-level alternatives for this project do not meet current project Purpose and Need, and federal and state design standards. Alternatives and engineering analysis of the low-level bridge option has shown that the low-level bridge option would have the greatest impact to the park. The Metroparks, ODNR- Scenic Rivers, and the Grand River Partners all support the dismissal of the low-level bridge alternative.</p> <p>The 2008 Noise Technical Report has determined that the noise levels in the park are predicted to decrease if either Alternatives A and B are constructed. Noise levels in the study area were predicted to increase ~2-3 dBA on average over the existing conditions. No modeled receptor is predicted to have noise levels approaching or exceeding the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria in the existing or the design year.</p> <p>The project involves two separate phases of improvements to Vrooman Road and the Vrooman Road Bridge. While these project phases are programmed and funded separately, the project is going through the NEPA environmental review process all together.</p> <p>The project will involve improvements to Vrooman Road, between I-90 and the new bridge, that meet current design standards, including sight distances and safety standards.</p> <p>Project funding is being secured through federal and local sources at an 80/20 match of federal to local funds. The identification of project funding is part of the on-going PDP process that will be finalized prior to construction of the project.</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
<p>main reason. But the number of accidents only works out to approximately 9 per year (including deer hits, not all due to the road).</p> <p>However, since the high-level option seems to be getting shoved down our throats, I still think there are ideas that could mitigate the damage. First, the speed limit would need to be lowered to the minimal allowable by law. I can't stress this enough. It's already dangerous for residents to pull out of our driveways today due to the hilly road combined with speed traffic. Increasing truck traffic with no reduction in speed will be a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>Another idea would be to relocate the project slightly to the east and run it right inside of the existing Metroparks parcel. This would spare the residents the least amount of property damage – and it's not prime, "virgin" parkland; it's already compromised by power lines. Yes, I realize there's federal law about not disturbing parkland – but our tax dollars are where they get their funding. It seems outrageously unfair to put their interests ahead of private residents when the land in question is not prime park land.</p>		<p>The Innerbelt and Vrooman Road Bridge projects are separate projects that fall under different programs and priorities.</p> <p>While the DRAFT Vrooman Road Planning Study misidentified Vrooman Road as a nominated evacuation route by DHS, the 2009 Purpose and Need Statement does not identify Homeland Security as a primary or secondary purpose goal of this project.</p> <p>The accident rate for Vrooman Road intersections is greater than Ohio's state average accident rate for similar intersections during the same period. The project will involve improvements that meet current design standards, including sight distances and safety standards.</p> <p>The CEI utility corridor is a utility easement within the Metroparks' Indian Point Park that pre-dates the park. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, does not allow a transportation project to use land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or land of an historic site if there are prudent and feasible alternatives to using that land. Because existing Vrooman Road can be used with all possible planning and design to meet current design standards, the new alignment would not be considered a prudent alternative that would minimize impacts to the park.</p>
<p>The wells along Vrooman Road (north of Route 90) will be polluted and dry up if the project goes through. I think you should follow the electric lines along the park. Then the owners along Vrooman Road and wells will not be affected.</p>	1	<p>If the project impacts the water wells along Vrooman Road, the county will bear the cost to connect properties to the municipal water supply.</p> <p>The CEI utility corridor is a utility easement within the Metroparks' Indian Point Park. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, does not allow a transportation project to use land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or land of an historic site if there are there are prudent and feasible alternatives to using that land. Because existing Vrooman Road</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
		can be used with all possible planning and design to meet current design standards, the new alignment would not be considered a prudent alternative that would minimize impacts to the park.
We really need this bridge. It will really help in winter due to slippery dangerous conditions. Also it will help with the constant flooding. It will also help with accidents since bridge is narrow. School buses have to be rerouted also when bridge closes due to flooding. Many times I have skidded down Vrooman Road hill sideways in winter and it will help that as well	1	Comment noted.
The new bridge plan needs to go through. For personal safety, time, and expense the new bridge needs to be put in because the current bridge is closed too often and dangerous to pass. It is unacceptable in the current state. Put the new bridge in.	1	Comment noted.
No high level bridge or tractor trailer traffic Keep Leroy rural. Without an evacuation excuse are you trying for accidents? 2000-2007 a total of 33 accidents per Lake County Sheriff's Dept. Do the math. Road is safe as is.	1	Comment noted.
<p>If we have to choose from either Plan A or B, Plan A would be my choice. There are a few reasons why I prefer this plan over the other one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, the Vrooman Rd. intersection already exists and people are used to the daily traffic patterns. (Also, many of the Leroy residents have children that attend the Riverside Local School District – giving them a more direct route to school, etc.) • Secondly, Rt. 84 will have to be reinforced and fixed sometime soon anyways – so why not do the whole thing at once when placing the bridge 	2	Comments noted.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
<p>there,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lastly, Plan B would create more of an inconvenience because of 3 intersections in such a short amount of distance (Vrooman Rd., Lane Rd., and River Rd.) and when re-routing River, the turn created to intersect with 84 would also create another intersection, and a less direct route. <p>Of course, either plan works but Plan A makes more sense because it is practical. Plan B seems like a lot of extra work going on in a close range (fixing/reinforcing 84 by the current Vrooman Rd. intersection, figuring out a way to reinforce a bridge structure over an already existing waterfall, creating a new River Rd. – as well as 2 new intersections, causing a complete mix-up and change of traffic patterns and directions. These are just to name a few...)</p> <p>I strongly urge you to go with Plan A.</p>		
<p>Huge concern – Plan A would negatively impact my property value. One of the buildings in our development would have to be removed. The proposed plan would place the roadway and intersection in the front yard of another bldg.</p> <p>It seems ludicrous to select Plan A when Plan B would create a direct path to Lane Ave. and make for a safer intersection and probably less expensive project.</p> <p>Rebuild bridge to Lane - Plan B. Allow ODNR and or Lake Metroparks to share/decide best plan for existing bridge and Vrooman Rd. It would be a huge asst to ODNR/Metroparks to have this are for public use. The bridge would only have to support foot traffic. A canoe livery could operate from either side of bridge – plenty</p>	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The project team is coordinating with the Lake Metroparks and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources – Wild and Scenic Rivers Division to minimize and mitigate impacts to the Mason’s Landing Park, the Indian Point Park, and the State Wild and Scenic Grand River.</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
of parking could be available to users n the areas adjacent to the bridge.		
<p>Leave us alone – we moved here over 20 years ago for the beauty of our land – and the river.</p> <p>My husband and I have added many improvements, some costly. Our water supply is very good.</p> <p>Quit wasting our money. This is a boondoggle. If you don't know the word, look it up.</p> <p>People have been talking about a change in this road since the 60s.</p> <p>Someone should audit how much money has been wasted on land survey and this type of surveys.</p> <p>Bridge unsafe – no – divers were hired and after 2005 flooding it was found safe and sound! Leave us alone</p>	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The 2006 bridge inspection report by Richland Engineering Limited rated the Vrooman Road Bridge as a 3 (serious condition). This overall rating is mainly due to the condition of the superstructure, the condition of the substructures, and the condition of the deck. The bridge is currently posted with a 16 ton limit with truck limits, and has been determined to be functionally obsolete.</p>
Yes, we like the plan to make River Road a dead end street.	1	Comment noted.
The bridge proposal is very expensive for a project not needed. By the time the bridge would be finished the cost could well exceed \$50 million. With the shape of the economy, projects more vital should be funded, i.e. infrastructure, water, sewer, roadwork and repair of current bridges.	1	Comment noted.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
Please do whatever it takes to put the bridge in for safety, emergency, and for convenience.	1	Comment noted.
<p>I understand the need to replace the Vrooman Road Bridge. My thoughts are this given the 2 alternatives.</p> <p>SR 84 east of the Vrooman/Madison Ave. intersection is basically collapsing into the gorge. This entire area must be rebuilt and reinforced to support road traffic. This will have to be done regardless of which alternative is chosen. Would it not be much more efficient to rebuild that area as part of a new bridge structure? As opposed to, in addition to a new bridge structure which is the case if the bridge runs to Lane Road. The Madison Road choice would also result in much less chaos and delays and detours construction itself.</p>	1	<p>Maintenance of SR 84 lies with the State of Ohio – Ohio Department of Transportation. Currently their maintenance records do not recognize an issue with SR 84 or a need for maintenance work as a result of SR 84 collapsing.</p>
<p>When this hill has been snow covered and cars struck, I have plowed it to allow myself and other to continue up the hill</p> <p>We cannot understand why it is being reported that there will be six hundred trucks a day using this road if the bridge is built.</p>	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The ODOT certified traffic model does not project any increase in truck traffic along Vrooman Road if the bridge is built. The NOACA traffic model predicts an increase of truck traffic to approximately 600 trucks per day if model parameters are adjusted to have 80% of the truck traffic from SR 528 move to Vrooman Road.</p>
<p>If the bridge was to come into Lane Road.</p> <p>Would a traffic signal be place at the SR 84 intersection? I feel a traffic signal would be needed due to the amount of traffic that would us the road.</p> <p>Where would the cul-de-sac be in relation to my current driveway and would it have any effect on my property? I am on the</p>	1	<p>Based on certified traffic counts, a four-way stop is warranted but a traffic signal is not currently warranted for this intersection. At the discretion of the Lake County Engineer, a signal can be installed at this intersection as part of the project.</p> <p>Preliminary engineering has the cul-de-sac for River Road at SR 84. The final alignment of the</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
corner of River Road and SR 84		cul-de-sac will be determined in the next phase of engineering. The cul-de-sac will be designed to meet current design standards, while minimizing impacts to private property.
<p>I found the public meeting presentation information was somewhat confusing. I think it would have been helpful to have tables/charts that organize the “impacts”/”issues” by topic so there was a way to easily review the differences in each alternative.</p> <p>The representatives from Baker and ODOT were knowledgeable but it was hard to keep the details and differences of each alternative in mind.</p> <p>I would like to see the bridge replaced rather than closed.</p> <p>I really don’t have a preference of either of the alternatives being considered.</p>	1	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
A hand-sketched drawing showing a low level bridge on Alternative B alignment was submitted	1	Sketch and comments noted.
I prefer Alternative A as I use this route to go to Riverside and/or downtown Painesville.	1	Comment noted.
My home is very close to Vrooman Rd and I am very concerned how this project will affect our property value.	1	Comment noted.
Firstly, I would like to thank those in attendance at the Public Involvement Meeting on January 27, 2009. Information provided was informative and presented in an understandable format for the general public. This was my first direct involvement with reviewing the details of the project at a public meeting.	1	Comment noted.

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
<p>At that time I requested copies of the environmental studies (I believe there were four). I was told these could be provided on a CD or other electronic means as they have been scanned. During my discussion with Mr. Thomas Sorge, Jr. I was informed of the reasons why other options were eliminated in favor of the two remaining high level bridge options. This was informative. I specifically inquired on the nature of the environmental impact for the various options. I was informed that the low level bridge option was considered to be considerably more detrimental to the environment than the high level bridge options. At the meeting I had no reason to doubt what was said was true, with an understanding that the environmental studies would be provided to me for further confirmation and assessment.</p> <p>After returning home and going out to the web I located a letter dated October 29, 2008 to Inspector General Thomas P. Charles from the Residents of Vrooman Road. Up until this time I have not talked to the residents of Vrooman Rd. but was struck with the apparent dissimilarity in what the letter stated vs. what I was told at the Public Involvement Meeting on January 27, 2009. The environmental information I received at the Public Involvement Meeting was strikingly different than that described in the letter. It is for these reasons that I now am doubting the validity of the environmental study comparisons of the various options, and at this time not only would request (as I did at the meeting) the high level bridge project environmental studies but those conducted on the low level bridge project as well. I think that is a reasonable request, based on the excerpts below provided from the referenced letter. I would appreciate if</p>		<p>Copies of the approved environmental studies have been posted to the Lake County Engineer's website (http://www.lakecountyohio.org/engineer/index.html) under the Vrooman Road Bridge Project Information link (http://www.lakecountyohio.gov/vroomanroad/).</p> <p>These studies include: Updated Planning Study (Revised January, 2007 and May, 2008) with ODOT acceptance email of 06-30-08</p> <p>Approved Phase I History / Architecture Report dated July, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 09-25-08</p> <p>Approved Phase I Environmental Site Assessment dated July 22, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 08-15-08</p> <p>Approved Noise Technical Report dated December, 2008 with ODOT approval letter of 01-21-09</p> <p>Public access to the Phase I Archaeological Survey Report (2009) is restricted and was not made available on the website, in accordance with federal regulations that restrict access to archaeological site information.</p> <p>The environmental information presented at the January 27, 2009 public meeting was extracted from the above cited technical reports, which were reviewed and approved by ODOT and state review agencies, as appropriate. These environmental studies and investigations were conducted on the current Feasible Alternatives A and B. Previous environmental efforts and efforts were conducted on the broader Conceptual Alternatives that include a low level bridge option. The Conceptual Alternatives were refined based on engineering and environmental requirements, and were developed into the Feasible Alternatives. The low level</p>

Public Involvement Meeting Summary
January 27, 2009 Public Meeting

Summary of Public Comments January 27, 2009 Public Meeting		
Comment	Number of Comments	Response
<p>you could please provide the environmental studies for both the high and low level bridge options. Hopefully this will clear up my doubt. I know that there are other opportunities to be able to speak with you or the environmental staff, and after I read through the information, I certainly will come to you with any questions.</p> <p>I am a long time resident of Leroy living near 5 points since 1985 and am particularly interested in maintaining Leroy as a community that values and preserves its environment wisely while being realistic about the needs of the community. Thank you for taking the time to review my written comments and I look forward to a review of the environmental study information that you can provide.</p> <p>Excerpts from the Letter, Dated October 29, 2008 to Inspector General Thomas P. Charles, from the Residents of Vrooman Rd.</p> <p><i>"On October 6, 2008, residents contacted Steve Madewell of Lake County Metroparks and asked him where the park system stood on the Vrooman Road bridge project. Mr. Madewell told us that the park system actually preferred the low-level bridge option. He directed us to Steve Roloson, Manager of Northeast Ohio Scenic Rivers, for further input."</i></p> <p><i>"On October 9, 2008, twelve residents of Vrooman Road met with Steve Roloson of Ohio Scenic Rivers. Mr. Roloson stated the low-level bridge option was his organization's preference. He said that a high-level bridge posed potential for much more damage to the Grand River Valley."</i></p>		<p>bridge option was removed from consideration during the previous stage of the project because it did not meet the project's Purpose and Need.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As part of the current project development process, the project team is conducting ongoing coordination meetings with the Lake Metroparks and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources – Wild and Scenic Rivers Division to discuss project alternatives, the results of environmental and engineering studies, and impacts to the Mason's Landing Park, the Indian Point Park, and the State Wild and Scenic Grand River.</p> <p>The October 29, 2008 letter was written prior to the completion of the above cited environmental studies and investigations. Following the completion and approval of these environmental studies and investigations, additional coordination with Lake Metroparks and ODNR has occurred which included a review of the environmental findings, the Alternatives Analysis, and the refinement of Feasible Alternatives.</p> <p>As a result of the project development process and coordination process, the Lake Metroparks and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources – Wild and Scenic Rivers Division favor the removal of the low-level bridge alternative or option from further consideration for project alternatives.</p> <p>The Grand River Advisory Council (GRAC) at the June 3, 2009 meeting passed a resolution rescinding the GRAC's previous resolution supporting the low-level bridge alternative, with a resolution supporting the removal of the low-level bridge alternative from further consideration.</p>